UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,919 08/06/2003		Claudius Zeiler	5858-00800	8849
Conley Rose, P.	7590 11/02/200 .C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. Box 68490	8	SWIGER III, JAMES L		
Austin, TX 787	U0- 4 9U0		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3775	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/635,919	ZEILER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAMES L. SWIGER	3775		

	JAMES L. SWIGER	3775	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi ral (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origing the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period fo	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed form.	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); er form for appeal by materially rec	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying t	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ^o 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co		•
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 	will not be entered, or b) will will not be entered.	•	-
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>29-34</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	udes NOT place the application in	i condition for allowan	ce pecause:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Thomas C. Barrett/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3775	/JAMES L. SWIGER/ Examiner, Art Unit 3775		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment filed 10/20/2009 has been fully considered however it is not persuasive. The final rejection mailed on 7/21/2009 stands. While it is agreed that the term "discrete" was disclosed prior to this communication, its interpretation has changed slightly. As noted in the rejection, applicant was unclear as to what was meant by a particular side of the device. While the claim was being interpreted in one specific manner (i.e. the side surface may be opposing, or the side away from the bone) the claim would still at least read on one of the other sides (such as along the thin side spine of the device). Additionally, the side spines could be considered part of the "surface" that faces away from the bone. If one approaches the device of having 4 distinct sides, only one actually faces bone. Additionally in terms of the rejection, it is held that Herzberg in view of Sioufi still meets the claim limitations. Herzberg discloses portions that are used for securing members, however they are not circumferentially enclosed. Sioufi discloses circumferentially enclosed apertures which also receive flexible securing members. As an additional matter, the scope of at least claim 29 has changed with the amendment filed 10/20/2009. Claim 29 did not necessarily require at least one "discrete" receiving member. Additionally this was rejected on the merits in light of claim 34. Further for claim 29, which did not previously point point out "said opposing" side surface, even if done for clarification purposes. It is further noted that claim 29 still appears to read on at least Wagner (US Patent 3,842,825). Wagner discloses an implant plate comprising a plate member (2) having a head and shaft, which is narrower), a bone-facing surface, and side facing away from bone, a plurality of holes for bone screws in the head (at least two for screws in the head, Fig. 4) as well as the shaft (at least two in the shaft) and at least two discrete receiving members protruding from the head (the remaining two bores in the head (8's, Fig. 5), that are also proximate the edge and also define a substantially circular and circumferentially enclosed aperture. It is noted that these bores are fully capable of being used by a flexible member to attach to bone. .